G. R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1907.
(Mulgrai)

File No. 224

Serial Nos. 1–8

Papers Filed.

Month July 1911

SUBJECT.

Dismissal of the appeal petition of Venkatial re, the Pujàriship of the Sri Byatarayaswamy temple at Chikka Mudure in the Kunigal Ta

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

OFFICE NOTE.

File No. 224-07

Subject.

Re appeal Petn. of Pujari Venkatiah of Bhaktarosaswami temple at Chikamadure in the Kunigal Tk.

From

The appellant Venkatiah

No. 2008 Dated 9. 11. 1907.

Pujari Venkatiah in his appeal Petn presented in this Office represented that the Puja hak of the Sri Bhaktarosa swami temple at Chikamadure in the Kunigal Taluk has been hereditary in his family, that at no time there were Brahmin Pujaries appointed thereto because the devotees offer animal sacrifices to the deity, & that this being so, one Varadiengar, Shanbhoga of Yedigoor presented petition to the local officers stating that

File No. 224 of 1907 Muzrai Secretariat.

the hereditary Pujari of the Temple & that thereupon, the Dy Commr passed a miscellaneous order directing that Varadiengar was the Pujari.

At the same time the villagers also presented a petn to this Office stating that Venkatiah was the hereditary Pujari and that Varadiengar should not be appointed thereto.

Both the appeal petn & the Mahazar were forwarded to the Dy Commr of the Kurnool District for report - (this Office No 9744 of 17th August 1907). The report is awaited

On the 8th Novr, Venkatiah wired to this Office praying that the Dy Commr's orders might be held in abeyance pending disposal of his appeal petn

With his application presented today, he has submitted an authenticated

Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. | File No. 224 of 1905

Copy of an order of the Kumgal Taluk Amildar which is an Endorsement to Varadiengar to the effect that although a perusal of the records of 1896 showed that Varadiengar was the Pujari, he having not entered upon his duties until the 9th August 1905, the Amildar would not interfere in the matter and allow him to do the duties.

The appellant prays that pending disposal of his appeal he may not be disturbed in his office of Pujariki and desire that with this view the D. Commrs order might be held in abeyance.

In the present petition it is further respectfully

Submitted 11-9-07

GPB—3,000—22-6-06

File No. 224 of 1907 | Muzrai Secretariat.

that the Amildar proceeded to the village on the 30th Oct. 1907 and got the appellant to hand over charge of the Sujavike to one Timmappaiya. It is therefore that a stay order is prayed for.

Muzrai Secretary's remarks:—

The report of the D/Commr and the records of the case have not been received. A reminder will be sent.

The appellant represents that he has been in long enjoyment of the Sujavikship and therefore it appears desirable that he should not be deprived of it pending the decision of the appeal.

The D/Commr may be asked to stay execution of his order pending the

Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat.

File No. 224 of 1907

final orders of Govt.

Submitted 2nd Joint Secy

[illegible] Ramalinga Rao
9 " 20

Approved
[illegible]
11/11/07

Draft early
Give Endst to Pabur
Returning the Papers [illegible] 11/11/07

Govt

GPB—3,000—22-6-06

File No. of 190 | Mużrai Secretariat.

General Revenue Secretariat. | File No. 224 of 1907 | 1764

Serial No.

To, The Dy Commr, Dumkur Dist

Docket no 22178 Dy 11.11.07

Forwards petition from Venkadiah and requests the Dy Commr to stay execution of his order pending the final orders of Govt on the appeal petition

To, Venkatiah of Chikkamadure,

Instr no 22179 Dy 11 11 07

Intimates the above

To, the Dy Commr, Dumkur Dist

Instr no 22180 Dy 11 11 07

forwards copy of the Instr in Continuation

From, the Dy Commr, Dumkur Dist

Letter no 415 Dy 21-6 Cy 11

Submits report with records

The dispute relates to the Archakship of Sri Byatarayaswamy temple at Chikkamadure in the Kunigal Taluk.

In the year 1895, one Venkata Rangiah claimed the Archakship in question as being hereditary in his family. The then Amildar Mr Parthasarathi Iyengar after examining the contending parties and the documents produced by them, passed an order holding that Ramabhogue Varadiah was the hakdarad Pujari and

Flag X1

O-922 Dy 15-6-1896.

Flag C

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

Serial No.

16-5-1893)
Hag Z

the pet^r if he had any right, might file a regular suit The original deed said to have been executed by Venkat (apl^t) in favor of Varadiengar is produced wherein the former has agreed to do Puja work for the latter on stipulated conditions. During the Parthasarathi Iyengar enquiry, Venkatiah has admitted that Shanbhogue Varadiengar is the hakdar Pujari

Hag P
C.B

On 27-11-1905, Shanbhogue Varadiengar having complained to the Dy. Comm^r that Venkatiah raised objection to hand over charge to him, that officer on perusal of the previous records passed orders restoring Varadiengar to the Archaki post.

Hag Y)

Against this order, Venkatiah has appealed to Govt.

The appeal-petitions were referred for report with records to the Dy. Comm^r The Amildar Mr Kesavasingh after examining the parties and their witnesses and the documents filed has submitted a detailed report holding that Venkatiah not being a hereditary Pujari may be removed from the Archakship—

Hag ✓
(no 111 D/10-7-1910)

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 224 of 19 07

Serial No.

for under disposal)

Mr. Dy Comm's present report enumerates the important documents produced in the case and discusses their genuiness

May this case be posted for hearing by the Councillor along with 2 other cases on the 21st June next?

Submitted for orders

AVC 1329 8/5/1911

68

Thus will be done, & approved

2nd Councillor) 4.5.11

Please post to 3rd July

All right

8/5/11

Prep draft Mthis

6/5/11

Submitted with 8 notices.

AVC 1329 8/5/1911

9.5.11

Mr. D.V. heard for Appt.

Mr. Parthasarathi's order cannot be executed now

The decree of 1893 has been

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

Serial No.

investigated about only on this occasion & the Asst has not evidence &c.

See Varadarāja's petn - (27.11.1908) against Asst's endorsement. It is against this petn.

Order resd. (to examine evidence before Asst)

21/6/11

Note

77 On 11.9.1896 Arulala Mr Parthasarathy Iyengar of his own motion issued an order to the Yedirajan Sthalattar enquiring who the Inam lands this Temple had and who was performing Puja in it. The Sthalattar reported in June 1855 that Sharabha Varadarāja Iyengar of Yedirajan claimed to be the Sthalattar Pujari, that he had Chittās his name and his grandmother Ranganāyaki's name are referred to, that his father appointed Satani Munuswami and Venkatachi to Worship and that he in 1853 appointed brother Govinda (this appt?) that Govindaraja had brought an ola Vartamanam

GPB—50,000—12 8-10

Serial No.

from Gondikotti for puja the Shekdar forwarded with his report his letters and the Kanam executed by the applt in favour of Stanley Vanden Iyengar in 1893

The Amildar was not instructed with this and he marked that it was a useless report.

On 23.9.1895 the Amildar recorded the statements of Vanden Iyengar, Venkatesh (applt), Venkatarangachi, Patel Hani Gowda and one Chikka Gowda

Flaa

Flaa B

Vanden Iyengar stated that the Puja work belonged to his family, that his grandfather performed puja himself, that his father could not perform puja as he had to discharge the duties of Stanley, that therefore he appointed one Moodla Satani to perform puja, that after Moodla's death his son Venkata performed puja, that after Venkata's death the applt was brought from another and appointed to perform puja, that he executed a Kanam Vanden Iyengar in May 1893, that subsequently on account of ill-feeling between the applt and Patel Hani Gowda the latter had brought one Venkatarangachi from Gondikotti for puja and that latter was performing puja. Vanden Iyer has added that he does not know how he can enter for the Puja work.

applt Venkatesh said that he has been performing puja for 7 years having been appointed by Vanden Iyer and that on account of ill-feeling Patel Hani Gowda had

NOTE— Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000— 12 8 10

Serial No.

brought in Venkatarangiah. Appt has written
explicitly protested about the Karar of 16.5.189.

Venkatarangiah claimed this office as the duty
of from his father Venkatesh who was Worshipful
and he added that an account of his father's
illness he could not for the alli when Chikkarangappa
s. [illegible] brought
appt Venkatesh for Pooja the knew nothing of Vasudeva
Iyengar's book.

Patel Mari Gowda supported Venkatarangiah's case
and Chikkanna supported Vasudeva Iyengar's case

On 14.10 1895 Venkatarangiah petitioned the D.
Court saying that the Amildar had deprived him of
the puja which he and his ancestors were performing

The DC has called for a report and on being informed
that the matter was under enquiry decided after the
Amildar had disposed of his petition from and cases and
ended the party.

The Amildar then examined the Shanbog of the
Village of Chikka Madavane where the Temple is situated
in June 1896 (the Shanbog not having after
earlier though many times been between visits
Bangalore) and on 10 6 1896 passed an order recognising
Vasudeva Iyengar's right. The decision was communi-
cated to the parties and no appeals were filed.

Now Appt Venkatesh must have entered during the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

Revenue at.

File No. 224 of 19 07

Serial No.

dntrs

On 29.4.1905 Varada Iyengar requested the Amildar to put them in possession of the Post Office and to remove appt Venkatesh who is the present (The petition is not on file) The Amildar on this endorsement No 224/S 29.8.1905 Said that as Varada Iyengar had not performed puja since the date the order was passed on the petition in favour the (the Amildar) came do nothing more and had no power to cancel the order made over to Varada Iyengar as petitioned for.

Flag C

Flag Y

Varada Iyengar appealed to the Dy Commr who after looking into the records passed an order in favour of Varada Iyengar.

Flag X

Flag Z

Venkatesh has appealed to Govt

The Amildar has held a further enquiry in this Course of which he has examined a number of witnesses on both sides

The case for Varada Iyengar is that his grandfather Varada Iyengar was performing puja, that his father Ranga Iyengar appointed Subramania Mooppanar who in turn appointed Venkatesh to perform puja, that after the latter's death the (Varada Iyengar) appointed appt Venkatesh as their pujari obtaining a Kaimpara dated 16.5.1893. Varada Iyengar also admits that the rent free lands for Archakatvam and other emoluments are enjoyed by the Chitis in whose name

Flag Z

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPS—50,000—12 8 10

Serial No.

Hag R

Hag E/V

Hag R

Hag R

Hag R

Names of himself & his father the Ra-
gama are recorded and also the Accom-
Statements produced at the Inam Settlement
to this effect that Anchap. Varadiah
forming the Puja and enjoying the land. In the
year 1890 Shanbag Varada Iyega has been
fined for taking water in anthrajas for
his Inam land.

Appellant Venkatrishi's case is that Mordhi
and Venkatrishi the Memorialists the brothers,
that appt is a close relative of the latter and
is therefore entitled to the puja. He also
avers that the Villagers appointed him in Feb
and executed a Kara. He says he is also called
Venkitaraghiah. He denies the execution of
the Kara of 16.5.1893 & says the mark no
Statement before Mr. Parthasarathy Iyengar.
The Villagers are mostly in favour of the
appt. Those in favour - Who are in favour of
Varada Iyega. They admit they attested the
Kara executed by appt in favour of
Varada Iyega. The Writer of this is a reputable
this
Patel of Belagunda in the Nagamangala
Taluk whom I have always looked upon as
being a respectable person. I think it is that
appt executed the Kara of 16.5.1893 & admitted
before Mr. Parthasarathy Iyega - i.e. that

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPR—50 00)—12 8 10

Revenue at.

File No. 224 of 19 07

Serial No.

Haque

Varada Iyengar vs Lakshman. Both these are
Common cases against Venkatarangiah who
claimed them. Venkatarangiah has now been
examined and admits on oath the now fact that
Varada Iyengar is the tenant.

The evidence seems to prove beyond all doubt that
(1) appellant is not related to Moodaliah & Venkatiah
who admittedly were performing Iyengi
who brought these villages in 1850 and
(2). That the alienation Kabala of 16-5-1893 in
favour of Varada Iyengar
and (3) that this had no right to the office.
If appellant had not claimed the office as his own he
might perhaps have in compliance with the wishes
of the devotees been entrusted as Iyengi. As he
asserts a title of his own he cannot perform the duties
of the Court forces it, he even entrusted as
pujaraka.

Perhaps it is open to appellant to contend that Varada
Iyengar has no locus standi that to oust Venkatarangiah Varada Iyengar and appellant made common
cause with each other, [illegible] that the
Varada Iyengar must establish his title
that the admissions of 1893 and 1895 cannot be used
Varada and that Varada Iyengar who now seeks to
oust appellant should establish his title.

NOTE— Contn. sheet

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

Serial No.	
	In this view it will be necessary to enter upon Vanda Ayyar's claim.
	In doing so it is not necessary to consider the Kaul of 16.5.1893. The following documents of earlier dates are to be looked into: —
Haq F.	(1). A title of the year Sowmya (1869) wherein Ragamma is referred to as the Archak of Byatarayaswami
Haq G	(2) A title of the year Rowdri (1861) wherein the Same is mentioned
Haq H	(3). A title of the year Durmati (1862 wherein the Same is mentioned.
Haq I	(4) A title of the year Kuchana (1865) wherein Yedeyan Sharang Vandaya is referred to as an Archak of Byatarayaswami.
Haq J)	(5) A title of the year Subhla (1869) wherein the Same is mentioned.
Haq K	(6) A title of the year Vibhava (1868) wherein the Same is mentioned.
Haq L	(7). Patta of Samajayishi Patti for five years from Raktakshi (1865) wherein the Same is mentioned
Haq M	(8). Kowla Statement furnished at the Inam Settlement in 1870 for Chicka Madhavi Village wherein it is stated that Archak Varnick is for some puja and Archaiyagi duties.
Haq S	(9) Similar Statement for Doddu Madhavi Village wherein the Same is mentioned

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12 8 10

Serial No.

Of course Rajamma and Vandrich are known concerned to be Srivaishnavas and Satanis; but it is not true alleged that the persons referred to in these are the ancestors of the appts.

In the Chittur of 1865 and onwards there referred to Sthanikas Vaindayya established the Vaindayya referred to at in the Inam Settlement of 1870 must be this Sthanika Vaindayya. Thus Sthanika Vaindayya's case appears to be clearly established.

I submit this draft giving effect to my findings in the above matter

Achutharamayya

23/6/1911

I am obliged to the A.G. for his clear note on the evidence on record. The order written by me may issue.

27/6/11

Hm 27/6/11

Issue 28/6/1911

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,00 1—12 8 10

Mur — File No. 224 of 190

Serial No.

No 116
Mur 224-07
Petr — D 12.7.1911
Dismissing the appeal
Copy of the above forwarded
to the Dy Comr. Thanjavur.

To
No 117 D 12.7.11. { Mr D. Venkatarama Ayyar Advocate
for the applt. Venkatachi
Forwarded Copy of the above.

To Varadarajan — Respt
No 118 D 12.7.1911
Forwarded Copy of the above

NOTE.—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12-8-10

18/8/907

ನಾನು ನಮ್ಮ ಮನೆಯಿಂದ ಅಂಗಡಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಲು

ಕಾಲುಭಾಗ ದೂರ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು 6 ಕಿಲೋಮೀಟರ್

ದೂರ ಉಳಿದಿದೆ. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಅಂಗಡಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ದೂರ

ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿ ಹೇಳಿ.

ಉತ್ತರ:

ಅಂಗಡಿಯವನಿಗೆ
ಉತ್ತರ ಬರೆದುಕೊಡಿ.

ಅಳತೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬರಲು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೆನು. ಅದರಂತೆ ಅವರು ಅಳತೆ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಅಳತೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಯೇ ಇರುವುದಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರಾತಿ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ.

ಸದರಿ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರು ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿರುವ ಮನವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರು ಸಾಗುವಳಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನು ಇರುವುದಾಗಿಯೂ ಅದನ್ನು ಸಹ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೋರಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನು ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 96 ಆಗಿದ್ದು, ಈ ಜಮೀನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಂದಾಯ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಕರು ವರದಿ ನೀಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಂದಾಯ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಕರು ವರದಿ ನೀಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನು ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 96 ಆಗಿದ್ದು, ಈ ಜಮೀನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಂದಾಯ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಕರು ವರದಿ ನೀಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನು ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 96 ಆಗಿದ್ದು, ಈ ಜಮೀನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಂದಾಯ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಕರು ವರದಿ ನೀಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನು ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 96 ಆಗಿದ್ದು, ಈ ಜಮೀನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಂದಾಯ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಕರು ವರದಿ ನೀಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನು ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 96 ಆಗಿದ್ದು, ಈ ಜಮೀನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಂದಾಯ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಕರು ವರದಿ ನೀಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನು ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂ 96 ಆಗಿದ್ದು, ಈ ಜಮೀನು ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಜಮೀನಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಸದರಿ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಕಂದಾಯ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಕರು ವರದಿ ನೀಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ.

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 7-8-05

(ಎಸ್) K. Seshagirirao

ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು ಮತ್ತು ಉಪವಿಭಾಗಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು

Compared

Asst. Commissioner

Asst. Commissioner

for Commissioner

తేదీ 9-11-1907

Muz. 1 A]

22407

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

190 —190

From

L. ANANTASAMI RAO, Esq., B A.,
Secretary to the Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
Muzrai Department.

To

The Deputy Comr
Tumkur District.

Dated

Despatched 19th August 1907

Received

General No. 974 — 975 & 976
Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure No 3

Has the honor to forward herewith for submission of the entire records connected with the case together with a detailed report, Appeal petition No 603 dt 22nd August 1907 from archak Venkataraya regarding the archakship of the Sri Boyataraya Swamy temple at ~~Chicka~~ Madhure

Belgaum Taluk

together with its one enclosure

and also petition No 602 of 3rd

August 1907 from Patel Dodde'

Gowda and others of the

said place supporting the

claims of the ~~above~~ appellant-

~~petitioners~~

R.O.

17/5/08

Secretary

W/ 12/8/08

Endorsement to the Petrs.

Draft as _____

Muz. 1]

190

From

Asst

To

The Deputy Commissioner,
Tumkur District.

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

In continuation of this Office No. 974, dated 17th August 1907, has the honor to forward herewith ~~paste~~ another petition Regd No. 2008, dated 9th November 1907, received from Venkatiah of Chikka Madhure, Kunigal Taluk, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner of the Tumkur Dt., declaring that Varadiengar

G.P.L.—3 000- 19-9 07

was the pujari of the Byatarayaswami temple at Chikka Madhure, ~~and~~ and stating that the appellant is the hereditary Pujari of the temple. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to stay execution of his order referred to above pending the final orders of Govt on the appeal petition, and to submit the entire records connected with the case together with the detailed report already called for, at an early date.

By order,

(Cis order)

11/11/07

Secretary.

Endt to Petr

11/11/07

Muz. 25]

ನಂ. 2279 Dt/11.11.07

ಮೈಸೂರು ಶ್ರೀಮನ್ ಮಹಾರಾಜರವರ ಗವರ್ನಮೆಂಟ್ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ

ಇಲಾಖೆಯಿಂದ

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

No. 22280

By order

Copy to Dy Commr. in contn of this office No 22780 11.11.07 By order

GPB—1,000—25 9 07

11/11/07

11/11/07 Secret

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
2238
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

29/11/07

This may be filed. Vide Reminder issued on 8-11-2007

29-11-07

ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 190ರಲ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮ್ಯಾಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟರು ಅಪರಾಧವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದಾದ ಬಗೆಗಳು; ಎರಡನೆ ಪರಿಚ್ಛೇದ; ಮಾಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟರ ಮತ್ತು ಪೋಲೀಸರ ಅಧಿಕಾರಗಳು

ಪ್ರಥಮ ಮಾಹಿತಿ ವರದಿ ಮತ್ತು ಪೋಲೀಸರ ತನಿಖೆ

ಸಂಪಾದಕರು ಪ್ರಜಾವಾಣಿ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ಇಂದಿನ ಪ್ರಜಾವಾಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾದ ಸಂಪಾದಕೀಯ ಲೇಖನ ಓದಿ ಸಂತೋಷವಾಯಿತು. ಸಂಪಾದಕೀಯ ಲೇಖನಗಳು ಸಮಾಜದ ಕಣ್ಣು ತೆರೆಸುವಂತಿರಬೇಕು. ಅಂತಹ ಲೇಖನಗಳು ಪ್ರಜಾವಾಣಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಾಗ ಪ್ರಕಟವಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸಂತೋಷದ ವಿಷಯ.

ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಕಳವಳಕಾರಿ ಸಂಗತಿ. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಕಳವಳಕಾರಿ ಸಂಗತಿ.

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಕಳವಳಕಾರಿ ಸಂಗತಿ.

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಕಳವಳಕಾರಿ ಸಂಗತಿ.

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಕಳವಳಕಾರಿ ಸಂಗತಿ.

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಕಳವಳಕಾರಿ ಸಂಗತಿ.

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಕಳವಳಕಾರಿ ಸಂಗತಿ.

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಕಳವಳಕಾರಿ ಸಂಗತಿ.

ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಭ್ರಷ್ಟಾಚಾರ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಕಳವಳಕಾರಿ ಸಂಗತಿ.

ಪಾಟೀಲರವರಿಗೆ

ನಮಸ್ಕಾರ

ಪಾಸ್‌ಪೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ

ನಂಬರ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ

ಚಲುವೇಗೌಡನ

ರುಜು

ಮೂಲ್ಗೌಡ

ನಮಸ್ಕಾರ

ತಿಂಮ್ಮೇಗೌಡನ

ನಮಸ್ಕಾರ

ವೆಂಕಟಪ್ಪಗೌಡನು

ಯಜಮಾನರುನಳಗುತ್ತಿ

ಪವಿಧನಂಜೇಗೌಡ

ನಮಸ್ಕಾರ —

ಬೆಳಗ್ಗೆ ಹೊತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ

ಮಧ್ಯಾಹ್ನ ಹೊತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ

ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲ ಹೊತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ

ರಾತ್ರಿ ಹೊತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ

ಮಧ್ಯರಾತ್ರಿ ಹೊತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ

ಬೆಳಗಿನ ಜಾವದ ಹೊತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ

ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಗೂ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಹೊತ್ತಿನಲ್ಲಿ

ಸರಿ

ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಉತ್ತರ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ

ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಉತ್ತರ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ

X ಮಾತ್ರವೇ ಕಾರಣ ಮಾಡಿದ ರಾಜ್ಯ

X ಸೀಲ್ಡ್ ಕವರ್ ಮೇಲ್ಕಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಶಾಂತಿ

X ಮೀಸಲಾತಿ ಕಾರಣ ಮಾಡಿದ ಶಾಂತಿ

X ಮಾತ್ರವೇ ಕಾರಣ ಮಾಡಿದ ರಾಜ್ಯ

ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ೧೨ ಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿ.

೧೨. ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿ.

ಅ) ಸಂಜೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಶುಚಿಯಾದ

ಆ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಇ) ಅಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ

ಈ) ಕೆಲವು ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಉ) ಕೆಲವು ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಊ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಋ) ಕೆಲವು ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಎ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಏ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಐ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಒ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಓ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಔ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿ.

೧೩. ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿ.

ಅ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಆ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಇ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಈ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಉ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಊ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಋ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಎ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಏ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಐ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಒ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಓ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಔ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿ.

೧೪. ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿ.

ಅ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಆ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಇ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಈ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಉ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಊ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಋ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಎ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಏ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಐ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಒ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಓ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಔ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿ.

೧೫. ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಉತ್ತರಿಸಿ.

ಅ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಆ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಇ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಈ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಉ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಊ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಋ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಎ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಏ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಐ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಒ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಓ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

ಔ) ಮಲಗಿ ಹಾಲು ಅಂಗುಳಿಗೆ

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
2582
MUZRAI SECRETORIAT

person

Request report

18-12-07

అజెండా 2-ఖి-07-9-11-07

18-12-07

కణ మయూరాక్షి కాంతినగరి వరలుచు

శివోల్లాసకాంతినగరి వరలుచు

ధీరోన్మేషకాంతినగరి వరలుచు

వీరలీలకాంతినగరి వరలుచు

ఉల్లాసకాంతినగరి వరలుచు

బాలికాంతినగరి వరలుచు

కాళీకాంతినమన మయూర్తికాంతినగరి వరలుచు

భీకర్మకాంతినగరి వరలుచు

మల్లికాంతినగరి వరలుచు

ఉల్లాసకాంతినగరి వరలుచు

మేలుమాలింగనకాంతినగరి వరలుచు

బాలూరినగరి వరలుచు

కర్ణాటకాంతినగరి వరలుచు

గుంభకాంతినగరి వరలుచు

నంగకాంతినగరి వరలుచు

దీపాంతరి శిష్యులు వసతిగొని వరలుచు

దీపాంతరి నిలయము కాంతి వరలుచు

ఇల

Muz. 1] 516

190

From

To

The Dy Commr

Tanjore District

Dated

Despatched 25.4.08

Received

General No. 4/110

No.

Enclosure No.

Referring to this office docket no 2278 Dy 11th november 1907 calling for the submission of a report on the appeal-petition of Venkatiah of Velichkka marthure, Kumigal Taluk, regarding the Archak ship of the Sri Rajagopala

G P b—3,000- 19-9 07

Swamy temple at the
place, has the honor to
forward herewith petition
registered no. 2582 dated
20th Dec. 1907 from chikke
Gowda and certain others
of chikka madhure Grama,
praying for the con-
firmation of Venkatiah
in the Archakship of
the temple. The Dy. Comm.
is requested to expedite
the submission of the
report already called for
on the subject

By order,

17/12/07

Secretary

Copy to the petns

190 1764

From

The Deputy Commissioner

Tumkur District.

To

The Secretary to Govt. of Mysore, Gen. and Rev. Departments, Bangalore.

Dated 21st April 1911

Despatched 22nd--do--

Received

General No. 415

No.

Enclosure No. 2 Files

Reports on the appeal petition of Venkataiya of Chikamadhure in the Kunigal Taluk for the Archakship of Sri Byataraswami temple and states that the appointment of Varadiengar is based on the taluk records of 1893 and Amildar's enquiry re the class to which the Archaks all along belonged.

GPB—75 reams—25 5 10

e of the Deputy Commissioner,

Tumkur District,

Dated Tumkur 21st/22nd April 1911.

From

M. Shama Rao Esq., M.A. ,

Offg: Deputy Commissioner,

Tumkur District.

To

C.S. Balasundaram Iyer Esq., B.A.,

Offg: Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore ,

General and Revenue Departments,

(Muzrai).

Sir,

With reference to your marginally noted communications forwarding for report petitions from Venkataiya of Chikkamadhure in the Kunigal Taluk appealing against this Office order restoring the Archakship of Sri Byatarayaswami temple at the place to one Varadaiengar, I have the honour to state that from the records it would appear that one Varadaiya, the grandfather of the respondent Varadaiengar , was the last to perform Puja and that his successors appointed Pujaries to officiate on their behalf . One of such Officiators is the appellant Venkataiya who was appointed in 1893 by Varadaiengar . On a complaint received in this Office in 1905 from Varadaiengar that Venkataiya raised takrar to hand over charge to him, records were called for and orders were passed in 1907 restoring Varadaiengar to the Archakship . It is against this order that Venkataiya has appealed to Government .

2. Venkataiya has executed a document in May 1893 in

favour of Varadaiengar stating that the claimant has the hereditary hak to the Archakship and that he himself has been appointed thereto 3 years ago to do Puja according to the wishes of the villagers. Venkataiya has therein allowed Varadaiengar to receive gutta produce from his lessees and has agreed to recover Devakolaga etc in return for which he has bound himself to pay annually 6 kolagas of ragi and the jodi and to conduct the Puja regularly. Venkataiya having denied execution of this document , its writer and the witnesses , who were examined by the Amildar , testify to the execution thereof . An authenticated copy of the takrar takhta shows that Varadiengar has been fined for taking water for the Inam land without permission . In the cooles of Inam Phaisal Pourika , the name of the Respondent's grandfather Varadaiya is entered. The title deeds are also reported to have been produced by Varadaiengar. In this connection I would also invite reference to the appellant's deposition dated September 1893 before the Amildar that he is the appointee of Varadiengar and to the Amildar's Office order No 922 , dated 15th June 1896 , declaring Varadiengar to be the hakdar Archak.

3. The appellant has produced a document executed by some of the villagers in July 1890 appointing him as Archak and another , a receipt by Thimmappaiengar to the same effect. The claimant of these documents as one Venkatarangaiya which the appellant protests to be his another name. The Amildar on enquiry concludes that Venkataiya is not known by any other name and that these documents are not genuine . He is also of opinion that the Brahmins were alone the Archaks and not the Satanis as alleged by the appellant .

4. The file of records connected with the case is herewith submitted for reference.

I have the honour to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

H. Shama Rao

Offg: Deputy Commissioner.

4 Copies

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 10 of 1910-11

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Venkatiah		Varadrengar,

SUBJECT.

Archakship of Sri Byatarayaswamy temple at Chickmadure in the Kunigal Dy.

Facts of the case

The Sri Byatarayaswamy temple at Chickmadure in the Kunigal Taluk is a muzrai institution endowed with Devadaya Inam lands. Sataru Mookkiah and his son Venkatiah were performing puja in this temple. After the death of the latter the appt was brought by the villagers in the year 1890 from Arakere in the Nagamangala Dy

– executed a kanar in favor of the respt admitting the latter's hak to the puja and agreeing to perform puja as his sumastha About this time one Venkatanangiah also a Setani claimed to be a relative of the deceased pujari Venkatiah and began to perform puje also being supported appointed by the village Patel. Nobody however complained in writing. The Amildar of his own motion in 1894 called for a report about the affairs of the temple, and in the course of the enquiry recorded the statements of the parties refd to above and others. In 1896 he decided in favor of the respts, and thus the matter ended then.

In April 1905 respt requested the Amildar to get the puja office made over to him by apltt who was his nominee. The Amildar said that as Repot had not since 1896 performed puja he (the Amildar) could do nothing then and that he has

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

the Office made over Respt Varadaiengar appealed to the Dy Commr who directed that respts should get the Office

Aplt having appealed to Govt, a report was called for the Amildar has held a further enquiry and examined all the witnesses cited by the parties and received the documents produced by them Moorthi

Aplts case is that Kuruba and Venkatiah were entitled to the office, that he as their heir is entitled to the same and that he did not execute any Kabar in 1893 in favor of respts or admit his title

The Case for the respts is that ~~Muruda~~ Moorthi and Venkatia were the nominees of respts ancestors whose right is refd to in old chittas and other documents, that aplt in no way related to Muruda Moorthi and Venkatiah, but is of a

executed the Karaar in 1893
and admitted respdt's title,
that apltt has since been
performing puja as respdt's
nominee and that as he is
now setting up an adverse
title, he must be ousted
the parties were present
in person and heard. Mr
Venkataramayya has also
heard on behalf of apltt

Decision

23/6/1941

The execution of the
document of 16th May 1893
by the appellant in favour
of the respondent is clearly
established. Trial Court held
with this admission in
the statement made before
the Asst Cr on 23rd Sept 1895 ~~clearly~~
prove that he had no
independent right to
the office, but held it
as pujaris under the
respondent. The Dy Cr's
order is therefore right
and must be upheld.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

One of the objections raised against it is that it has been passed not in a suit but in an informal proceeding: the jurisdiction to decide on hujari rights in Muzrayi institutions is taken away from Civil Courts, and the questions arising in connection with them have to be decided by Revenue Offices & Courts in the Muzrayi department. There are however no rules in force making a distinction between suits and ~~in~~ less formal proceedings in these cases. There has been full enquiry held in this case by

R.S. 271

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

the Amildar in the presence of both parties, and there is not the slightest ground to suppose that the Appellant has in any way been prejudiced by any defect of procedure. There is nothing to be gained by directing that another enquiry should be held after staying the petition as a regular suit.

The appeal is dismissed.

27/6/11

6/7/11

Munsiff's Dis 224-07
retng. the records receiv dy 12/7/1911
with his letter no. 415 dy
21st April 1911.

By o
Bs
7/7/11
Dft)
RL for Offg. Lang

Copy to me o/r
Advocate for the apt. Ayya, No. 117 dy
12/7/1911

By order,
Bs
7/7/1911
Dft)
RL for Offg Secretary

Copy to the respt No. 118 dy 12/7/1911
Vaidiyan,

By order,
Bs
7/7/1911
Dft)
RL Munsiff's Secy.
7.7.11

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

APPEAL No. 10 OF 1910-11.

Appellant	*Vs.*	Respondent
Venkatiah		Varadiengar.

Subject.

Archakship of Sri Byatarayaswami temple at Chikmadurai in the Kunigal Taluk.

Facts of the case.

The temple of Sri Byatarayaswami at Chikmadurai in the Kunigal Taluk is a Muzrai institution endowed with Devadaya Inam lands. Satani Mudliah and his son Venkatiah were performing puja in this temple After the death of the latter the appellant was brought by the villagers in the year 1890 from Arakere in the Nagamangala Taluk and asked to perform puja. In the year 1893 appellant executed a karar in favour of the respondent admitting the latter's hak to the puja and agreeing to perform puja as his gumasta. About this time one Venkatarangiah, also a Satani, claimed to be a relative of the deceased pujari Venkatiah and began to perform puja also, being supported by the village patel. Nobody, however, complained in writing. The Amildar of his own motion in 1894 called for a report about the affairs of the temple and in the course of the enquiry recorded the statements, of the parties referred to above and others. In 1896 he decided in favour of the respondent and thus the matter ended then.

In April 1905 respondent requested the Amildar to get the puja office made over to him by appellant who was his nominee. The Amildar said that as respondent had not since 1896 performed puja he (the Amildar) could do nothing then and that he had no power to get the office made over. Respondent Varadiengar appealed to the Deputy Commissioner who directed that the respondent should get the office.

Appellant having appealed to Government, a report was called for. The Amildar has held a further enquiry and examined all the witnesses cited by the parties and received the documents produced by them.

Appellant's case is that Mudliah and Venkatiah were entitled to the office, that he as their heir is entitled to the same and that he did not execute any karar in 1893 in favour of respondent or admit his title.

The case for the respondent is that Mudliah and Venkatiah were the nominees of respondent's ancestors whose right is referred to in old chittas and other documents, that appellant is in no way related to Mudliah and Venkatiah, but is of a different sub-sect, that he executed the karar in 1893 and admitted respondent's title, that appellant has since been performing puja as respondent's nominee and that as he is now setting up an adverse title he must be ousted. The parties were present in person and were heard. Mr. Venkataramaiya was also heard on behalf of appellant.

Decision.

The execution of the document of 16th May 1893 by the appellant in favour of the respondent is clearly established. That coupled with his admission in the statement made before the Amildar on 23rd September 1895, proves that he had no independent right to the office but held it as gumasta under the respondent. The Deputy Commissioner's order is therefore right and must be upheld. One of the objections raised against it is that it has been passed not in a suit but in an informal proceeding. The jurisdiction to decide on pujari rights in Muzrai institutions is taken away from civil courts, and the questions arising in connection with them have to be decided by Revenue officers and Government in the Muzrai Department. There are, however, no rules in force making a distinction between suits and less formal proceedings in these cases. There has been full enquiry held in this case by the Amildar in the presence of both parties and there is not the slightest ground to suppose that the appellant has in any way been prejudiced by any defect

Muzrai, dated 12th July 1911.

of procedure. There is nothing to be gained by directing that another enquiry should be held after styling the petition a regular suit.

The appeal is dismissed.

No. 116—Muz. 224-07, dated Bangalore, 12th July 1911.

Copy of the above is forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, returning the vernacular records received with his letter No. 415, dated 21st April 1911.

By Order,

for *Offg. Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.*

Exd —c v.

GOVERNMENT OF HIS
THE MAHARAJA OF MY

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 12th July 1911

No. 116
Muz. 224-07

GPB—2 8-11—200